

From the INTERNATIONAL BUREAU

LFM

PCT

NOTIFICATION CONCERNING
TRANSMITTAL OF COPY OF INTERNATIONAL
PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY
(CHAPTER I OF THE PATENT COOPERATION
TREATY)
(PCT Rule 44bis.1(c))

To:

GOSNELL, Guy, R.
Alston & Bird LLP
Bank of America Plaza
Suite 4000
101 South Tryon Street
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
ETATS-UNIS D'AMERIQUE

Alston & Bird

SEP 08 2006

Received By R

Date of mailing (day/month/year)

31 August 2006 (31.08.2006)

Applicant's or agent's file reference

42933/288287

IMPORTANT NOTICE

International application No.

PCT/IB2005/000333

International filing date (day/month/year)

09 February 2005 (09.02.2005)

Priority date (day/month/year)

20 February 2004 (20.02.2004)

Applicant

NOKIA CORPORATION et al

The International Bureau transmits herewith a copy of the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

The International Bureau of WIPO
34, chemin des Colombettes
1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland

Authorized officer

Cécile Chatel

Facsimile No. +41 22 338 82 70

e-mail: pt13@wipo.int

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY (Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

Applicant's or agent's file reference 42933/288287	FOR FURTHER ACTION		See item 4 below
International application No. PCT/IB2005/000333	International filing date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 09 February 2005 (09.02.2005)	Priority date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 20 February 2004 (20.02.2004)	
International Patent Classification (8th edition unless older edition indicated) See relevant information in Form PCT/ISA/237			
Applicant NOKIA CORPORATION			

1.	This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 bis.1(a).																								
2.	This REPORT consists of a total of 7 sheets, including this cover sheet. In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.																								
3.	<p>This report contains indications relating to the following items:</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 10%; text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 30%;">Box No. I</td> <td style="width: 60%;">Basis of the report</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. II</td> <td>Priority</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. III</td> <td>Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. IV</td> <td>Lack of unity of invention</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. V</td> <td>Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VI</td> <td>Certain documents cited</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VII</td> <td>Certain defects in the international application</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VIII</td> <td>Certain observations on the international application</td> </tr> </table>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the report	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the report																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention																							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application																							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application																							
4.	The International Bureau will communicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but not, except where the applicant makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date (Rule 44bis .2).																								

The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland Facsimile No. +41 22 338 82 70	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">Date of issuance of this report 22 August 2006 (22.08.2006)</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;"> Authorized officer <div style="text-align: right; font-weight: bold;">Cecile Chatel</div> </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">e-mail: pt13@wipo.int</td> </tr> </table>	Date of issuance of this report 22 August 2006 (22.08.2006)	Authorized officer <div style="text-align: right; font-weight: bold;">Cecile Chatel</div>	e-mail: pt13@wipo.int
Date of issuance of this report 22 August 2006 (22.08.2006)				
Authorized officer <div style="text-align: right; font-weight: bold;">Cecile Chatel</div>				
e-mail: pt13@wipo.int				

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

REC'D 13 JUL 2005

WIPO

PCT

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To:

Alston & Bird LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street,
Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
USA

Date of mailing
(day/month/year)

07-07-2005

Applicant's or agent's file reference
42933/288287

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.

PCT/IB2005/000333

International filing date (day/month/year)

09.02.2005

Priority date (day/month/year)

20.02.2004

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

H04Q 7/32, G06F 12/14

Applicant

Nokia Corporation et al

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.I(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☒ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further opinions, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/SE
Patent- och registreringsverket
Box 5055
S-102 42 STOCKHOLM

Authorized officer

Roland Landström /OGU

Facsimile No. +46 8 667 72 88

Telephone No. +46 8 782 25 00

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/IB2005/000333

Box No. I **Basis of this opinion**

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - ☐ the international application in the language in which it was filed
 - ☐ a translation of the international application into _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rules 12.3(a) and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
 - ☐ a sequence listing
 - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
 - ☐ on paper
 - ☐ in electronic form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
 - ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
 - ☐ filed together with the international application in electronic form.
 - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

International application No.

PCT/IB2005/000333

Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
------------------	---

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	<u>2, 4-6, 13, 16, 18-19, 21, 23, 26</u>	YES
	Claims	<u>1, 3, 7-12, 14-15, 17, 20, 22, 24-25, 27</u>	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	_____	YES
	Claims	<u>1 - 27</u>	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	<u>1 - 27</u>	YES
	Claims	_____	NO

2. Citations and explanations:

The invention in independent claims 1, 15 and 24 is intended to prevent unauthorized access to information stored in a memory within a mobile device. To this end, the mobile device receives a remotely originated wireless request and limits/disables access to the memory based on the request.

The invention in independent claim 27 is intended to facilitate limiting device functionality. To this end, the device receives a signal to disable device functionality, limits device functionality and transmits a return signal indicating successful disabling of device functionality.

Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: US 20030065934 A1
D2: EP 0836131 A2
D3: US 5748084 A
D4: US 5734978 A
D5: US 20030013491 A1

Document D1 (paragraphs 0011 - 0046, figures 1 - 2, abstract) discloses a system etc. that limits mobile device (PDA, computer 100, 200) functionality via a wireless network (104). The mobile device (100, 200) receives (214) a remotely (102, 202) originated request to disable the mobile device (100, 200); and limits access to (erases) memory (206) within the mobile device (100, 200) based on the request.

...../.....

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.
Continuation of Box V.

1 (2)

Certain other functions may also be disabled, see abstract. The mobile device (100, 200) has a GPS receiver (212) for reporting its location, see paragraph 0024.

Document D2 (column 2, line 21 - column 11, line 29, figures 1 - 15, abstract) discloses a system etc. that limits mobile device (portable computer 16) functionality via a wireless network (cellular telephone link). The mobile device (16) receives a remotely (140) originated request to disable the mobile device (16) and limits access to (erases) memory (152, figures 9A, 9B) within the mobile device (16) based on the request. Certain other functions may also be disabled, see abstract. The mobile device (16) acknowledges that the request has been completed, see column 11, lines 17 - 29.

Document D3 (column 1, line 45 - column 10, line 64, figures 1 - 6, abstract) discloses a mobile device (portable computer 100) that transmits data files, activates a beacon, destroys stored data and activates a sound alarm in response to a request.

Document D4 (column 1, line 65 - column 8, line 37, figures 1 - 4, abstract) discloses a mobile telephone (2) that destroys data stored in the mobile telephone (2) in response to a request in a received telephone call.

Document D5 (paragraphs 0012 - 0054, figures 1 - 4, abstract) discloses a system etc. that limits mobile phone (1) functionality via a wireless network (cellular telephone link). The mobile phone (1) receives a remotely (personal computer 7) originated request to disable (prohibit a key operation for issuing a call) the mobile phone (1), limits access to (prohibits reading) a memory (16) within the mobile phone (1) based on the request and transfers personal data from the memory (16) to the personal computer (7).

The invention claimed in independent claims 1, 15 and 24 is known from each of documents D1, D2, D3, D4 and D5. Therefore, the invention claimed in claims 1, 15 and 24 lacks novelty and inventive step.

The invention claimed in independent claim 27 is known from document D2. Therefore, the invention claimed in claim 27 lacks novelty and inventive step.

.../...

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.
Continuation of: BOX V.

2 (2)

The features of most of the dependent claims are known from documents D1, D2, D3, D4 or D5:

The invention claimed in at least claims 3, 9 - 11, 14, 17, 20 and 22 is known from document D1. Therefore, the invention claimed in claims 3, 9 - 11, 14, 17, 20 and 22 lacks novelty and inventive step.

The invention claimed in at least claims 3, 7 - 9, 14, 20, 22 and 25 is known from document D2. Therefore, the invention claimed in claims 3, 7 - 9, 14, 20, 22 and 25 lacks novelty and inventive step.

The invention claimed in at least claims 3, 10 - 12, 14, 17 and 22 is known from document D3. Therefore, the invention claimed in claims 3, 10 - 12, 14, 17 and 22 lacks novelty and inventive step.

The invention claimed in at least claims 3, 14 and 22 is known from document D4. Therefore, the invention claimed in claims 3, 14 and 22 lacks novelty and inventive step.

The invention claimed in at least claims 9, 12, 20 and 22 is known from document D5. Therefore, the invention claimed in claims 9, 12, 20 and 22 lacks novelty and inventive step.

In claims 4 - 6, 13, 16, 18 - 19, 21, 23 and 26, slight constructional variations are suggested that are obvious to a person skilled in the art. Therefore, the invention claimed in claims 4 - 6, 13, 16, 18 - 19, 21, 23 and 26 lacks an inventive step.

To sum up, the invention claimed in at least claims 1, 3, 7 - 12, 14 - 15, 17, 20, 22, 24 - 25 and 27 lacks novelty and inventive step. The invention claimed in claims 2, 4 - 6, 13, 16, 18 - 19, 21, 23 and 26 is novel but lacks an inventive step. All the claims fulfil the requirement of industrial applicability.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/IB2005/000333

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawing or on the question whether the claim are fully supported by the description, are made:

In claim 6, the expression "the wireless network protocol" is in the definite form although it has not been mentioned before.